Case 1:13-cr-00304-MGC Document 16 Filed 02/13/14 Page 1 of 23

Elulabac UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 13-CR-304 (MGC) V. 5 AHMED ABASSI, 6 Defendant. Conference 7 -----x 8 New York, N.Y. January 30, 2014 9 11:32 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. MIRIAM GOLDMAN CEDARBAUM, 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 BY: MICHAEL J. FERRARA, ESQ. 17 BENJAMIN NAFTALIS, ESQ. Assistant United States Attorney 18 FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK INC. Attorneys for Defendant 19 BY: SABRINA SHROFF, ESQ. 20 21 ALSO PRESENT: MARWAN ABDEL-RAHMAN, Arabic Language Interpreter 22 23 24 25

1 (In chambers)

THE COURT: Very well. What is the status of this case?

MR. FERRARA: Good morning, your Honor. Michael Ferrara and Benjamin Naftalis for the government.

At this point, your Honor -- well, I guess over the last several months the government has been collecting and producing discovery. I know your Honor's been apprised of two letters involving discovery that Ms. Shroff sent over to chambers prior to the conference today.

I'll be quite frank with the court. There have been some complications with the collection and production of the discovery. The unclassified discovery went out relatively smoothly. And just to give — just to sort of remind your Honor, the allegations in this case arise from in large part Mr. Abassi's stay in the United States for a few weeks in say April of last year. He met with an undercover — unbeknownst to him, he met with an undercover several days, dozens of days, over the course of that month, and he was recorded in the course of doing so. They primarily — the undercover and Mr. Abassi primarily spoke to one another in Arabic, and there are often what we call sort of redundancies in the recordings. That is to say, there may be multiple recording devices happening simultaneously in order to ensure that if one malfunctions, others are capturing the conversation.

THE COURT: The undercover was wearing a wire?

MR. FERRARA: The undercover was wearing, essentially -- essentially wearing a wire at times. At other times he was speaking into his cellphone, which was recorded at times. Other times he was in a car or in places where other recording devices might have been. And so we --

THE COURT: Well, how many different recording devices were used?

MR. FERRARA: Well, if your Honor wants a specific answer, then we would have to go into a classified proceeding. I can't answer your Honor's question precisely. But suffice it to say that there were multiple recordings of various conversations. So we produced — we had been collecting and producing the unclassified recordings. And like I said, we produced — I don't want to say hundreds of hours, but it may very well be close to that. It may be a hundred or so hours of recordings.

THE COURT: Now who classified the documents?

MR. FERRARA: Well, we produced unclassified recordings. The classification of some of the other material arose from the nature of how the material was seized and applications were made in order to do that.

Oh, I'm sorry. To the extent, your Honor -- it was the FBI that was seeking some of those authorizations, if that's what your Honor's asking. So when it was created, it

was classified at that time. It wasn't later classified. The techniques were classified that were being used. And again, if your Honor wants to sort of at some point have a classified update, we can do that, but I think the point of all this is to say that we have produced dozens and dozens of recordings to the defense. And we produced that both — and that's audio and video, and we produced the recordings in an unclassified format and we also produced them in a classified format.

THE COURT: What is the format that makes them classified?

MR. FERRARA: Well, I shouldn't have said -- it's not the format. I just mean to say there were some recordings that were unclassified that we produced, and others that were classified that we produced.

Now the primary problem stemmed from — it took quite longer than we expected — because of the just sheer amount of the recording, it took longer than we had expected to get authorization to turn some of that material over, so as Ms. Shroff notes, to the extent your Honor had set a September date deadline for discovery, we certainly produced quite a bit of material in advance of that, but I think all of the classified discovery was produced after that date due to the difficulties of obtaining that authorization. After

THE COURT: Who gave the authorization?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FERRARA: The FBI. So at that point, after Ms. Shroff had reviewed -- to her credit, I honestly think Ms. Shroff and her team have reviewed every single minute of the discovery because we talked about it at length. Ms. Shroff sent over a letter requesting additional discovery, much of which we do not think she is entitled to. However, it prompted us to look for other things in hopes -- well, it prompted us to look for things that perhaps we had missed. We wanted to, of course, be sure we had given everything over, and it turned out in fact some things had been missed. At that point we asked Ms. Shroff to -- and I believe she has agreed to a CIPA protective order, a classified discovery protective order, which we then forwarded to the court I want to say two days ago. I've also brought a copy today. Once your Honor enters this order, which the parties consent to, we will then produce what we believe is the completion of the classified discovery. And again, we have that ready to go upon the court's entry of that order, and of course your Honor doesn't have to sign that this second, but as soon as the court is able to, we will turn over that additional material.

THE COURT: This is an undisputed matter.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, we've agreed to it so that -- we've been waiting almost a year for the discovery so --

THE COURT: I understand. But whatever your motive -- MS. SHROFF: Yes, it's undisputed.

THE COURT: -- there's no question it's undisputed.

Okay.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ NAFTALIS: So Ms. Shroff has executed that as well.

MS. SHROFF: Yes.

MR. FERRARA: So that's the sort of update on the discovery front, your Honor.

And then as to plea negotiations --

THE COURT: Originally I thought I had been told that Mr. Abassi was going to enter a plea.

MR. FERRARA: Well, your Honor mentioned that at the first conference, but that -- I apologize. That should not have been relayed to the court. I don't know how your Honor got that message. That was never the case here, that Mr. Abassi intended to plea. Perhaps -- if that was a miscommunication from the government, then I apologize, but that was not the case and your Honor was wrongly informed of that. But I will say --

THE COURT: We're not talking about someone who is cooperating with the government.

MR. FERRARA: No, absolutely not. Correct.

Right. Mr. Abassi is not cooperating with the government. But we are having, your Honor, what I would call -- and perhaps Ms. Shroff will disagree, but I think we're having productive discussions towards a resolution of this

case. We had made Ms. Shroff an offer, and I won't, of course, involve the court in the details of this, but we had made

Ms. Shroff an offer. She -- Mr. Abassi, through Ms. Shroff,
rejected that initial offer and came back with certain other
ideas, which we are now considering, and we hope to have a -- I
guess hers was a counteroffer -- a counter-counter to

Ms. Shroff this week or next. So I think, your Honor, quite
frankly, that the discussions have been very productive, and
I'm relatively -- I'm still hopeful that this case could
result -- could be resolved pretrial in a way that both parties
find fair.

So that's where we're at, your Honor. I think the only thing the government thinks we ought to do -- well, maybe I'll let Ms. Shroff speak and then we can propose --

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. FERRARA: I'll wait to hear what Ms. Shroff has to say and then --

THE COURT: Ms. Shroff?

MS. SHROFF: Good morning, your Honor.

Your Honor, there are a couple of points with which we disagree, and if I could just tell the court what those are.

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MS. SHROFF: So the first one is to distinguish between what is produced to us as discovery and what we believe Mr. Abassi's entitled to under Rule 16. So if there is a

conversation on a particular day with, let's say, the government's undercover and it's recorded in three different methods or three different equipments, we're not unreasonable. We're not asking for all three equipments.

THE COURT: You'd like one of them.

MS. SHROFF: We'd like the one and we would like an affirmation from the government that that one is the most complete so there are no dropped sentences, there are no dropped words. So if they used a cellphone, a body wire, and a home recording device — and just so the court knows, that could very well be the case here because Mr. Abassi was made to live in the co-op in the undercover's home, and we have good reason to believe that the home was bugged. That would be the best recording to get. So that's the one issue about recordings.

But then there's also a secondary issue. The secondary issue is whether or not we have a complete recording and then a complete translation of the recording, which we do not have and the government has refused to give us because their view is, they're not obliged to give it to us and they are not obliged to bear the cost; they only have to give us what they are planning to use at trial. So obviously they're not going to use statements that my client made that would help him. For example, when they ask him to do something heinous, my client says, "No, I'm not going to do it." So if my client

has said that once, the government has translated and given it to me once. But if I'm to represent Mr. Abassi at either plea negotiations or at a trial, the fact that he repeatedly told their undercover officer that no, he would not go and blow up a building and he would not do anything in the present time is very, very important. It's important because it would obviously affect plea, it would affect how a trial proceeds, how a jury's impacted, and god forbid he's convicted, it would certainly impact the court at sentence. So that — and I'm really — this is not a forum where I'm trying to say the government's being this or the government's being that.

Assuming all good faith to the government, Mr. Abassi still doesn't have all of that information, and that's the nonclassified stuff.

And, you know, we've e-mailed the government several times. We're very cognizant that they have a workload, they have only so many Arabic interpreters, there are three other cases before other judges going to trial. Mr. Abassi's sitting in jail. It's tough on him is an understatement. And if we could, we would like this over. So we most respectfully ask that the court set a firm deadline by which the government must comply regardless of the cost, at least as to giving us all of the unclassified discovery in a way that the defense can properly use because, you know, there are two Supreme Court cases that say now that we have an obligation not just to be

effective at trial but to be effective at plea. To be effective at plea, I need all the information. That's information that even the government's conceding I'm entitled to.

Then there is now --

THE COURT: Wait just one moment. Do I understand the government argues that Mr. Abassi is not entitled to a recording of all of his statements, there are only certain statements he's entitled to?

MR. FERRARA: Absolutely not. That is not our --

MS. SHROFF: The transcription, your Honor.

MR. FERRARA: Just to be clear, we have given

Ms. Shroff all of the recordings that we have, save this latest

classified discovery that we have to produce upon entry of this

order. We've given her all of the recordings we have. If

there's multiple recordings, we've given her the multiple

recordings of the different ways so she can hear it herself.

We have given — for each recording, we have given a running

summary that was created by interpreters as they heard it, as

it was actually happening. We've also given summaries of the

calls, of the recordings themselves. Detailed summaries.

Now we have, since we first saw the court, been asking Arabic interpreters to transcribe verbatim certain portions of those calls. Now I don't speak Arabic. What we've asked, what we've asked is for the agents to review, using the summaries

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and their memories of the events, to review portions of the calls that would be useful either to the defense or to the government and we then had those farmed out for verbatim transcription, which we provided to Ms. Shroff on a rolling basis, and I think she's gotten about a dozen of those or so. And they're only portions, that's true, but your Honor, there are literally just -- Mr. Abassi was in New York City for maybe a little under a month. He met with the undercover almost every day. They met for multiple hours in the day. It would be overwhelming to ask for each of those meetings to be transcribed in full when much of their discussions are irrelevant. Sometimes they go out to dinner and they talk about the food. There's nothing in the law that says that we have to produce verbatim transcriptions of every recording. The defense can do that. They can apply for funds to the If she has -- and I've offered Ms. Shroff, I've said to Ms. Shroff, based on the summaries, or based on conversations with your client, if you'd like me to have this part or this part transcribed, I'm happy to farm out some other portion, but we are not going to ask -- we do not have the resources to have every second of dozens of hours, hundreds, potentially, of hours of recordings farmed out when much of the information is apropos of nothing. But Ms. Shroff has all of it and of course can have certain things transcribed if she'd like, or if she wants to target limited things, we would be happy to farm out

those portions for her.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SHROFF: The reason my client talked ad nauseam to the undercover is because they had the undercover talking ad nauseam to my client. That is how the government chose to set up this case. If they chose to set it up this way, the least you can do to a defendant being hauled into a federal court in the United States of America is give him that discovery. you didn't want to set it up that way, you didn't want to produce it that way, you shouldn't have talked to him about dinner. But that's the whole crux of the case. Their crux of the case is that this is a man who came here only for a specific purpose and we're telling you, no, that's not why he came here at all, and all of these other conversations that he has, when he has conversations with the undercover saying, "Listen, I'd really like to go back to my wife, my wife and I are wanting to have children, I'd like to get a job, I'd like to apply for a job, I'd like to go back to Canada, will you help me get to Canada," all of those things may not certainly be the crux of their case, but they certainly go to show that he does not have the mind-set that they want him to have. If the government's not going to produce it, at the end of the day, if the court's not going to order that, which ruling we would obviously respect, our office will have to find a way to fund that. But the problem so far has been that I do not believe we still have all of the calls in all of the --

THE COURT: That's the first question. 1 MR. FERRARA: As I mentioned, your Honor, the defense 2 3 does not as of now, but once your Honor orders this protective order, then we will be in a position to say that all the calls 4 5 that we know exist, all the recordings that we know exist have 6 been produced, upon --7 THE COURT: That you will immediately produce 8 everything. 9 MR. FERRARA: The rest. 10 MR. NAFTALIS: They're ready. We have it already on It's ready to turn over as soon as the order is entered. 11 12 THE COURT: You agree to this order. 13 MS. SHROFF: I've agreed to the order, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: So you have no objection to that being 15 done. MS. SHROFF: No. I would like it to be done. 16 17 their response to me, number 28, as Ms. --UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's our letter. Sorry. 18 MS. SHROFF: According to our review of the discovery, 19 and we informed the government on December 10th, we have 48 20 21 phone calls for which we have recordings but no translations or 22 summaries; nothing at all. 23 THE COURT: And that's what you're interested in. 24 MS. SHROFF: That is the one thing I'm interested in. 25 The other thing I'm interested in is making sure that

the government has given us all of the recordings which -- and some of them I still think they haven't given to us because those recordings keep coming up during conversations, and I think at the end of the day Mr. Ferrara would acknowledge he hasn't -- the government hasn't yet given those to us. That is putting aside the whole issue of classified discovery. That is not classified. This is unclassified stuff.

And then there are several other discovery-related requests that we have made, which may or may not technically fall within Rule 16, but if the case is this serious, many a judge has ordered the government to produce it or at least produce it before it would normally be produced so that the defendant is properly represented during plea negotiations. So far we seem to be in agreement on only one issue. The only thing they have agreed to produce to us so far is the phone calls which they haven't yet produced to us -- am I wrong or --

MR. FERRARA: I'm sorry. I missed the last part.

THE COURT: The phone calls which you have not yet produced.

MS. SHROFF: And 48 phone calls for which you've given us no transcription.

MR. FERRARA: Your Honor, again, we are not required under the law to provide them with transcriptions of the calls. We have done so for most of the calls because we are attempting to help however we can, and if Ms. Shroff has portions of the

calls that she would like transcribed, we're happy to do so. She has all -- she has almost all of the calls, with a very small exception of a few classified calls that we will produce promptly upon the entry of that order, and then we would represent to the court at that point that all of the calls that we know of have been turned over.

And when I say calls, I shouldn't say calls. All the recordings, because many of the conversations — most of the conversations were in person.

And your Honor, I worry that the parties are wasting your Honor's time a little bit here. Ms. Shroff has provided us a detailed letter. We have responded point by point. We don't think she's entitled to much of it. If she wants to make a motion, we're happy to respond to that.

THE COURT: But I thought you just told me that if I sign this order, you will produce all of them.

MR. FERRARA: Well, not all of the things in Ms. Shroff's letter. Ms. Shroff asked for things that in the government's view are clearly not embraced by Rule 16, Brady, Giglio, or any other theory of discovery. She's asking for things in here that are outside the bounds of discovery that we do not intend to produce.

THE COURT: The defendant is not entitled to all his prior statements?

MR. FERRARA: We have produced all his prior

statements or upon the entry of this, we will have produced.

I'm talking about other things, your Honor, things that are

not --

MS. SHROFF: I don't agree. I don't think the government has produced all of the defendant's postarrest statements. I think the government has produced the one single version of all the defendant's postarrest statements, so if the defendant's postarrest statements, for example, were quoted in a memo to the head of the FBI, the government has chosen not to produce that document to us, which we've specifically asked for but the government has chosen not to give us.

THE INTERPRETER: Your Honor, I cannot keep up with this speed.

MS. SHROFF: Sorry. So technically the government has complied with his postarrest statements, right?

THE COURT: You're being asked if you have produced all of the defendant's statements after his arrest.

MR. FERRARA: Yes, your Honor, we have. What

Ms. Shroff is suggesting is that she is somehow entitled to us

quoting from reports when we discuss the case internally. She

is not entitled to that. We have produced to her reports and

notes of that post -- of the postarrest statement. Absolutely,

yes.

MS. SHROFF: We don't have reports and notes. We do not have the handwritten notes of any of Mr. Abassi's

postarrest statements. We've asked for them. We weren't given them. Those notes are absolutely not produced to us. We specifically asked for them. We don't have them.

The other thing, for example, we've asked for is, during Mr. Abassi's questioning, the FBI agents allowed Mr. Abassi to make phone calls to his wife and only allowed him to talk to his wife for as long as he would then compensate them by talking to them further. We've asked for those phone logs. We haven't gotten them. We have asked for those recordings. We haven't gotten them. This is all discovery. We're entitled to this discovery. And even if we're not entitled to it technically under Rule 16, this is a serious matter and we should be able to have this information to properly come up with a plea offer.

MR. FERRARA: Your Honor, if I'm mistaken -- I've made a note to myself -- I will of course make sure to produce those notes. And if I'm in error, we will correct that immediately.

THE COURT: All right. They will produce them.

MR. FERRARA: And if those calls between Mr. Abassi and his wife were recorded, we'll produce those as well.

MS. SHROFF: We'd like the phone logs, your Honor.

MR. FERRARA: I don't know if those were recorded, your Honor.

MS. SHROFF: That may be, but there are phone logs that show, in the interrogation room where Mr. Abassi was being

held for seven days in a row, he was made to call his wife and 1 then the FBI would cut off the calls. We would like the phone 2 3 log for those calls. We'd like the phone -- the phone -- yeah, 4 the recording -- the log. Just the plain old log. You know --5 MR. FERRARA: I'm happy to discuss this. 6 THE COURT: These are matters on which you should be 7 able to agree. MR. NAFTALIS: Your Honor, some of these are the first 8 9 time we're hearing these, and we will look into it. If there 10 are phone logs, if there are recordings and if they exist, 11 we'll produce them. 12 THE COURT: Fine. Very well. That's not in dispute. 13 MS. SHROFF: Okay. 14 MR. FERRARA: But again, just --THE COURT: Always quit when you're ahead. 15 (Defendant and his counsel conferring) 16 17 MS. SHROFF: Your Honor --18 THE COURT: Mr. Abassi says that he made many more 19 calls than what was produced. 20 MR. FERRARA: Two responses to that, your Honor.

MR. FERRARA: Two responses to that, your Honor. Some, as -- three responses.

21

22

23

24

25

First, we either have or will within two days have produced all of the calls that we have, number one.

Number two. I have as a courtesy attempted to produce all of the unclassified material directly to Mr. Abassi at his

2.2

facility. We have sent over hard drives and discs. I hope he has received all of that and I have -- and I know there has been some problems, but if he has not received some of that, of course we will endeavor to get it to him.

Number three. There is classified discovery that Mr. Abassi is not entitled to review at the prison, which is all I can say about that right now.

MS. SHROFF: Okay. So in two days, your Honor, we should have 200 phone calls, one way or another. By "we," I mean counsel, cleared counsel. And if not, we'll come back to the court on that particular issue.

THE COURT: Very well. I certainly can't decide what you have or haven't done. Well, if that's the stumbling block, you're quite right and we should go forward and see what happens, what you receive. There's no purpose served in discussing what may be resolved.

MS. SHROFF: That's correct, your Honor.

MR. FERRARA: If your Honor wants to set another conference date for 30 or 45 days just to take this back up, at that point Ms. Shroff will have had a chance to review what we produce either today, tomorrow, or Monday.

(Defendant and counsel conferring)

MS. SHROFF: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MR. FERRARA: I just proposed possibly a conference to see if these issues have been resolved after the next

1 production.

MS. SHROFF: That's fine, your Honor. We can come back whenever the court would like us back.

THE COURT: I need my calendar.

THE CLERK: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: How long is it going to take to check on that you have produced or not produced --

MR. FERRARA: Well, things like notes, your Honor, will take me a matter of hours, but what I think is — what we want to be at least — what I think we want to know most importantly for the next conference is, is there still a dispute about calls that have been produced or not produced or other potential discovery that has or has not been produced in this next batch, so — which will take Ms. Shroff a little bit of time to review. It's not going to be an insubstantial amount of material that she's going to receive, and so it would just be — we sort of defer to Ms. Shroff on how she wants to do that, whether —

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. FERRARA: I think it should be less than maybe 30 days, but I defer to Ms. Shroff.

MR. NAFTALIS: Ms. Shroff, it's about 15 DVDs' worth of material.

MS. SHROFF: Okay.

MR. NAFTALIS: Just for your timing.

```
1
                THE COURT: What is your estimate of how long it will
      take you to review this?
 2
 3
               MS. SHROFF: 30 days? We may need more, your Honor,
 4
      so should I give an outer date or it would be better if I asked
 5
      for an adjournment?
 6
                THE COURT: Well, let's try to be reasonable, yes.
 7
      It's to your advantage to resolve this matter as quickly as you
 8
      can.
 9
               MS. SHROFF: Yes, your Honor, that's true.
10
                (Defendant and his counsel conferring)
11
               THE COURT: Shall we set February 27?
12
               MS. SHROFF: That's fine, your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: Which will give you almost a month.
14
               MS. SHROFF: That's fine.
               MR. NAFTALIS: Your Honor, what time on the 27<sup>th</sup>?
15
16
               THE COURT: At 11 a.m.
17
               MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, before we adjourn today, I
18
      just want to give the court some sense that we believe we are
19
      missing calls, not just transcripts but actual calls for the
      dates March 29<sup>th</sup>, 30<sup>th</sup>, 31<sup>st</sup>, April 2<sup>nd</sup>, and
20
      April 17<sup>th</sup>.
21
22
                THE COURT: All right. That's certainly a help if you
23
      identify that.
24
               MR. FERRARA: By the next conference, your Honor, we
25
      hope to either have produced those calls or to have told
```

Ms. Shroff in no uncertain terms that we do not believe they exist.

THE COURT: Very well. Then this matter is adjourned.

MR. FERRARA: Your Honor, the government moves pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 3161(h)(7)(A) to exclude the time between now and February 27th from the operation of the speedy trial clock. As your Honor's heard, there's a massive amount of discovery in this case, largely in Arabic, recordings and --

THE COURT: And I have no reason to think that the defendant doesn't agree that the time should be excluded.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, we don't challenge the speedy trial clock.

THE COURT: No, but I want to be sure that Mr. Abassi understands that what's being asked is that the trial be put over for a longer period in order to get this material, that the need for that material, the time required for it, outweighs, in the interests of justice, a speedier trial. Do you agree with that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Very well. Then I will adopt that and exclude the time between now and Thursday, February $27^{\mbox{th}}$, 11 in the morning.

MR. FERRARA: Nothing further from the government, your Honor.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, given the government's insistence that they will not translate all of the calls in their entirety, the defense will submit a letter to the court seeking additional funds to allow that to happen. We'll set forth our request in as much detail as we can. THE COURT: Good. MS. SHROFF: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Very well. Good luck to everybody. MR. FERRARA: You too, your Honor. Good to see you. MR. NAFTALIS: Good to see you. THE COURT: Thank you.